

Message

From: Kalandiyur, Nesamani@ARB [nesamani.kalandiyur@arb.ca.gov]
Sent: 6/10/2019 7:24:00 PM
To: OConnor, Karina [OConnor.Karina@epa.gov]
CC: Graham, AshleyR [Graham.AshleyR@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: SC 2012 PM2.5 MVEBs - Question

Sure, Karina!

See you tomorrow!

Nesamani S Kalandiyur, Ph.D.,
Manager, Transportation Analysis Section
Air Quality Planning & Science Division
Air Resources Board
(916) 324-0466

The energy challenge facing California is real. Every Californian needs to take immediate action to reduce energy consumption. For a list of simple ways you can reduce demand and cut your energy cost, see our web site at <http://www.arb.ca.gov>

From: OConnor, Karina <OConnor.Karina@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2019 9:16:33 AM
To: Kalandiyur, Nesamani@ARB
Cc: Graham, AshleyR
Subject: RE: SC 2012 PM2.5 MVEBs - Question

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Wondering if we could find some time while Ashley and I are there tomorrow? See agenda below...

Draft Agenda
June 11, 2019 CARB/R9 EPA Staff-to-Staff Meeting

10:00am-2:30pm
Cal-EPA HQ Building, Conference Room 550

10:00-10:05am: Gather/nametags
10:05-10:10am: Review agenda (Ariel/Laura)
10:10am-10:30am: introductions/icebreaker (Ariel/Laura)
10:30-11:10am: Process show-and-tell (20 minutes each agency) (Wienke?/)
11:10am-11:20am: Break
11:20am-12:00pm: Breakout sessions (need session leader for each session)
Purpose: meet staff working on similar plans, discuss priorities and project planning

1. South Coast (John U + others?)

2. San Joaquin

3. Smaller district attainment plans

4. Regional haze (Panah and others)

12:00pm-1:00pm: Lunch (BYO, grab something from a nearby café, or pre-order; groups can convene in the park or courtyard)

1:00pm-2:10pm: Round-robin brainstorm/discussion activity: focus on lessons learned from 2008 ozone attainment plans, and plans for the 2015 ozone standard (10 minutes per station, 40 minutes to discuss): (need facilitator(s)) (Nancy and Panah?)

1. What worked well for our collaboration process for 2008 ozone plans?

2. What could have been improved?

3. How could we design our collaboration process for plan development for 2015 ozone plans to be even more effective?

2:10pm-2:20pm: Wrap up, next steps (Ariel/Laura)

2:20pm-2:30pm: Managers remarks (Webster/Carol/Anita)

From: Kalandiyur, Nesamani@ARB <nesamani.kalandiyur@arb.ca.gov>

Sent: Thursday, June 6, 2019 4:43 PM

To: OConnor, Karina <OConnor.Karina@epa.gov>

Cc: Graham, AshleyR <Graham.AshleyR@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: SC 2012 PM2.5 MVEBs - Question

Hello Karina,

Do you have to time discuss the inventory questions tomorrow. I'm available on following timeslots: 10-11am or 1:30-2pm or 3-5pm.

Thanks,

Nesamani

From: OConnor, Karina <OConnor.Karina@epa.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2019 8:50 AM

To: Kalandiyur, Nesamani@ARB <nesamani.kalandiyur@arb.ca.gov>

Cc: Graham, AshleyR <Graham.AshleyR@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: SC 2012 PM2.5 MVEBs - Question

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Great – thanks!

From: Kalandiyur, Nesamani@ARB <nesamani.kalandiyur@arb.ca.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2019 8:48 AM

To: OConnor, Karina <OConnor.Karina@epa.gov>

Cc: Graham, AshleyR <Graham.AshleyR@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: SC 2012 PM2.5 MVEBs - Question

Hello Karina,

We are looking into the SC emission inventory and get back to you later this week or early next week.

Thanks,

Nesamani

From: OConnor, Karina <OConnor.Karina@epa.gov>

Sent: Monday, June 03, 2019 2:13 PM

To: Kalandiyur, Nesamani@ARB <nesamani.kalandiyur@arb.ca.gov>

Cc: Graham, AshleyR <Graham.AshleyR@epa.gov>

Subject: SC 2012 PM2.5 MVEBs - Question

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Nesamani – I’m reviewing the South Coast PM2.5 plan for the 2012 standard and have a few questions about the difference between the baseline on-road emissions and the budget on-road emissions. Our SIP lead (Ashley Graham) asked Scott King about the differences (see below) but we’re not clear on his explanation.

	2019			2022			2025			2028		
	VOC	NO _x	PM _{2.5}	VOC	NO _x	PM _{2.5}	VOC	NO _x	PM _{2.5}	VOC	NO _x	PM _{2.5}
Baseline On-road Emissions*	82.49	166.52	19.8326	68.19	124.92	19.5098	58.43	84.89	19.4811	52.66	76.27	19.5414
Rounded	83	167	20	69	125	20	59	85	20	53	77	20
Budget On-Road Emissions**	82.52	168.13	19.81	68.22	126.26	19.48	58.51	86.26	19.44	52.68	76.28	19.50
Motor Vehicle Emission Budget	83	169	20	69	127	20	59	87	20	53	77	20

*Source: Total on-road mobile, paved road dust, and unpaved road dust are from Appendix III, Attachment A. Road construction dust is from Appendix III, Attachment F. – Emission Inventory

** Source: Table VI-D-3

First - With regard to differences due to VMT – the differences are too large to account for updated VMT estimates. SCAG’s VMT estimates change very little with each update. For example, I’ve reviewed SCAG’s RTPs from 2016-current and the baseline emissions (from EMFAC2014) for Nox for 2019 range from 166.6 to 166.8 tpd.

I’m not sure what Scott meant by SCAG calculates emissions differently. So I looked at the details in their conformity findings for the last several years. I noticed that they included “Baseline Adjustments” for Nox and VOC for 2019, 2030 and 2040. Across all RTP/TIPs, the adjustments are fairly consistent. (see table below) The conformity analysis references a March 12, 2012 letter from ARB regarding the source of the reductions.

	2019		2030		2040	
	VOC	NOx	VOC	NOx	VOC	NOx
Baseline Reductions	7.2	1.9	1.8	0 – 0.1	0.5	0

Since these looked like off-model reductions (possibly from Carl Moyer?), I wanted to make sure that they were appropriate for use with EMFAC2014. Rongsheng could not find the 2012 letter, but sent me the attachment (see Table 29A). However, it is not clear how the numbers in that table translate to the current “Baseline Reductions” used by SCAG. Also, while the 2019 Nox Baseline Reduction is close to the difference between the Emission Inventory on-road emissions and the Motor Vehicle Emission Budget’s on-road emissions, there are no real differences in the VOC estimates – so it’s hard to say if this is correct without knowing where the baseline reductions come from. I have asked SCAG for more information on this.

This review raises several questions.

- 1) – It is still not clear why there is a 2 tpd difference between the Nox in the on-road emissions on the plan’s emission inventory and the on-road emissions in the motor vehicle emission budget? Thoughts?
- 2) – I’m wondering if the Baseline Reductions used by SCAG are a carry over from an earlier version of EMFAC and shouldn’t still be applied? Thoughts?

Thanks so much, Karina

From: Graham, AshleyR

According to Scott, there are two possible reasons for the small differences (see table below): 1) there may have been a new RTP or amendments to the RTP between the time that the District developed the baseline inventory and when CARB ran the budgets; and/or 2) CARB doesn’t consider PTO emissions as on-road but SCAG does (and SCAG provides the mobile emissions numbers to the District for the baseline inventory). Scott noted that these differences were already discussed with EPA in the context of the ozone plans, although I think the situation with the ozone plans is different because I believe CARB provided updated budgets for ozone as part of the 2018 SIP update whereas they didn’t provide updated budgets for PM2.5.

So far as I can tell, there weren’t any amendments to the 2016 RTP/SCS prior to the submittal of the 2016 AQMP (it looks like the 1st amendment was adopted in April 2017 where as the 2016 AQMP was adopted in March 2017). I’m not sure what the magnitude of PTO emissions is and if that could reasonably explain the difference.

One last thought is that the requirement under 93.118(e)(4)(iv) is that the MVEBs are *consistent* with the requirements for RFP and attainment. I’m not sure if the differences between the baseline and budgets (~1%) are large enough to be considered inconsistent.